

The MARYLAND GAZETTE, EXTRAORDINARY.

ANNAPOLIS, May 8, 1766.

NOTICE is hereby given, That the Subscriber keeps a LIVERY STABLE in Annapolis, in the Stables of Benedict Calvert, Esq; Mr. Neven having resigned the same. All Gentlemen that please to favour him with the Care of their Horses, may depend upon good Usage from their humble Servant, RICHARD MURROW.

FIFTEEN POUNDS REWARD.
RAN away from the Subscriber, in *Sassafras Neck, Cecil County*, on the 9th of April last, Three English Convict Servant Men, viz.

John Sandals, born in *Shropshire*, about 28 or 30 Years of Age, a very stout, likely Fellow, of a fallow Complexion, with short brown Hair, and several large Cuts in his Head: He wears a very light coloured Country Cloth Coat, with Metal Buttons, striped Swarskin Vest, with Lapels, much worn, old Buckskin Breeches, Country Linen Shirt, Castor Hat little worn, Yarn Stockings, and Country Shoes, with large cast Brass Buckles.

John Hockaday, born in *Devonshire*, about 40 Years of Age, a low squat Fellow, fair Complexion'd, with short sandy Hair, and is almost Bald: He wears an old Snuff coloured fine Cloth Coat, bound round the Edges and Button Holes with Worsted Binding of a lighter Colour, and old cut and raised Velvet Vest, a light coloured Country Cloth Pea Jacket, old Leather Breeches, Country Linen Shirt, old ribb'd Worsted Hose, Country Shoes, with large plain Silver Buckles, and a good Felt Hat. He has with him an old green Rider's Almanack, an old Twine Purse, and a Silver Stock-Buckle.

Edward Thompson, (belonging to *Henry Ward Pearce*) born in *Shropshire*, about 30 Years of Age, upwards of 6 Feet high, short black Hair, some Scars in his Head, and stoops a little in his Shoulders: He had on a Country Cloth Coat, brown Coat and Breeches, with Metal Buttons, spotted Flannel Jacket, old Whitney Surtout Coat, brown Yarn Stockings, half-worn Shoes, square Brass Buckles, Onabrig Shirt, and an old fine Hat.

They have some Money with them, and have also taken a Servant's blue close-bodied Coat, of fine Cloth, some fine Shirts, a Silk and Linen Handkerchief, Stockings, and other Things, so that it's probable they may vary their Dress. They all ran away last Year, but not together, were brought home at considerable Expence, and were forgiven on Promises of Amendment. As they have now gone off without the least Cause of Complaint, have lived extremely well, and have behaved with the greatest Ingratitude, it is hoped every Person will, as far as it lies in their Power, hinder their getting off.

Whoever secures them in any Jail, so that they are had again, shall receive a Reward of FIVE POUNDS Pennsylvania Currency for each, and if brought home reasonable Charges, paid by

MICHAEL EARLE,
HENRY W. PEARCE.

Perth-Amboy, New-Jersey, March 10, 1766.
FIVE POUNDS REWARD.

RAN away from the Subscriber, in *October 1762*, a Mulatto Woman, about 30 Years of Age, named *Viola*, she was born in *New-Jersey*, is of a middle Stature, very active, and it is said she pretends to be a Free Woman; she has since been seen in Company with one *James Lock*, on *Susquehanna*, and was afterwards, in 1764, taken up and committed to the Jail of *Fredrick-Town*, in *Maryland*, on Suspicion of her being run away, from whence she is said to have made her Escape; she then acknowledged that she had belonged to the Subscriber, but that she being imposed upon by being sold a Slave for Life, run away, which is only an Invention of hers, for she was born a Slave, and as such, was sold to the Subscriber, by the Executors of her former Master, of *Fredrick*, in the County of *Montgomery*, and Province, aforesaid, deceased, for the Sum of Ninety Pounds, Proclamation Money: She is now supposed to be some where in *Maryland*, *Virginia*, or *North-Carolina*; she is Cunning and Artful, and very probably may have chang'd her Name, and will make her Escape if taken, unless great Care is taken to secure her.

Whoever shall take her up, and secure her in any of the Prisons in *Maryland*, *Virginia*, or *North-Carolina*, or elsewhere, so that she can be brought Home, or sold there, shall have the above Reward, paid by *JONAS GREEN*, at *Annapolis*, or the Subscriber.

(3^m) PHILIP KEARNT.

The following Piece was receiv'd, and intended for Publication last Fall; but the GAZETTE soon after stopping for a while, prevented. And altho' it is now so long after Date, and Circumstances are very different from what they then were, yet, to oblige the Author, it is inserted in this additional Sheet.

VIRGINIA, September 1765.

Mr. GREEN,

HAVING seen it hinted, that the Virginians are now become quite easy as to the late Attacks on their Liberties as Englishmen; I am so sensible that it is a gross Misrepresentation of them, that I cannot help making Use of your truly Patriotic Paper, by your Permission, to remove the Aspersions; and must declare, that we are in general, as truly sensible as People can be, of the Value of every Privilege we have hitherto enjoy'd as Britons. There is indeed a Silence in the Public Papers, no ways consistent with the Injury sustain'd in the Violation of those Rights. But, may not the Press here be in a different Situation from what it is in other Colonies? I would not by this be understood, to mean that there is a controuling Power over it, assumed by any one; because it would give me Concern to think so much amiss, (even in such a single Instance) of a Conduct that must in the general be much admired; neither would I be thought to hint, that the Printer is in himself less disposed than others, to oblige his complaining Countrymen, in Publishing their laudable Endeavours for the Recovery of their Liberties; but is it not possible, that his own Fears may suggest to him, that his Interest as Printer to the Public, would be affected by it, should he insert any Thing that might be displeasing to some, who may fancy themselves too much obliged to wish, that the violated Rights of the People, may not be the Subject of a Public Paper; lest it should be misconstrued into a Consent to an Opposition to the Measures of the M—y? This I have ventured to refer to the Consideration of your Northern Readers, as a plausible Reason for the beforementioned improper Silence; and I hope it will be without any Offence to one Excellency or Honourable Gentleman.

I must now beg Leave to intrude a little upon your Readers, a short tho' just Delineation of the Englishman's Rights, in order to deduce from them the Claim of the Colonists; and to support that Claim, against the several Arguments made Use of, in Justification of the Violations that have been committed against those Rights; whether by the Right Honourable Pamphleteer in *England*, upon this Occasion, or by the several Modifications that have been given in Conversations in this Colony, and elsewhere, (of those his Arguments) by Persons so warped either by constant Avarice, or Private Interest, as to be incapable of enjoying one generous Sentiment of Liberty.

Altho' the Constitution of *England* cannot be ascertained into any settled Form from any Instrument, extant before the Time of the great Charter, the Charter *de foresta*, and the several Statutes made in Confirmation of the Constitution; yet by great and indisputable Authorities, it is to be demonstrably shewn, that the fundamental Laws of the Constitution, were coeval with the Government of *England*, and never the Dislates of any Conqueror's Sword, the Pleasure of any King of the Nation, or the Results of any Parliament that ever sat in the Land: By which the People freely enjoy and occupy their own Properties, by being Governed and Taxed only by such Laws as they themselves desire, consented to originally by the Majority of their own Voices as Freemen; afterwards, for the sake of avoiding Confusion, in the Meetings of excessive Numbers, consented to by the Majority of their Representatives, chosen by themselves, which continued till the Days of *Hen. VI.* when it appears, that the King by his Parliament, limited the Choice of Representatives, by the Freemen of *England*, to the Choice only of such Representatives, by Persons who should be possessed

of Land or Tenement, to the Value of Forty Shillings by the Year at least, above all Charges; from whence ever since, has the Right of Representation in Parliament, been attendant on the several Freeholds in the Shires and Counties, excepting as to particular Privileges of Representation which have been granted by Parliament. Now as I have observed—that the beforementioned Right Honourable Pamphleteer, and others after him, have endeavoured to reduce this Right of Representation, into a mere imaginary Thing, in order to bewilder those Ears, which he tells the World had no Understanding that he had to deal with; I will here, before I attempt to deduce the Colonists Right to such Representation, beg Leave to give what I think a sensible Answer to that Pamphlet in that Point. As this Right of Representation was made attendant on Freeholds, how can Copyhold and Leasehold Estates, unless for Life, Claim such a Right? When it is evident that the Freehold must enjoy it wherever it is lodged, and as all rich and flourishing Towns, which are not particularly distinguished with the Privilege of Representation, must receive the Benefit of the Representation attendant as it is, on the Freeholds, in the Shires and Counties where they lie, how can it be said that they are not represented in Parliament? Again, as all the wealthy Possessors of Personal Property, must Live or Trade on some Freehold in some Shire or County, are not they really represented in Parliament by the Representation of the Freehold, because they do not vote for the Representative, as the Law has lodged the Right in some other Person? Will not common Sense then tell such a Quibbler in Argument, that *Locke*, *Sydney*, *Selden* and Others, could only have reason'd upon such a Principle in the Constitution, when they declared, that every Man in *England* was represented in Parliament, tho' he himself had not a Right to vote for a Representative.

Now as this Representation in Parliament, was evidently inherent by Birth, in every Englishman, and only modify'd from Time to Time by the Consent of the People, into the Possession of the Freeholds, in order to avoid the Inconveniencies and Evils that did attend the Meetings of excessive Numbers; and as every Part of this new World, has been long settled by the emigration of those very Englishmen, who were thus possessed of this inherent Birthright; is it a Claim unnatural or unjust in their Descendants to assert their Rights, to be govern'd and tax'd only by Laws consented to, by the Majority of their Representatives in Parliament? Every emigration appears expressly by Charter or Agreement, to have been with the actual Consent of the Sovereign, who alone had the Right of settling the Acquisitions of the Crown. And we find by those Charters, it was expressly declared, that the Subject dwelling in any of the Colonies, and all his Children born or to be born, should enjoy all Liberties, Franchises, and Immunities, of Free Denizens and Natural Subjects to all Intents and Purposes, as if they had been Abiding and Born within the Realm of *ENGLAND*; and that every doubt or ambiguity that could arise from the Wording of the Charters, should be construed solely for the Benefit of the Subjects in the Colonies. From whence it seems clearly to be intended, that the Subject should enjoy his legislative Right, which he held as inherent by his Birth, in every extent of it: Therefore whenever it was directed that legislative Assemblies should be held in the several Colonies, either by Charters or Instructions from the Sovereign, it was not so much a mere Emanation of Royal Favour, as the Effect of Royal Prudence and Honour, consistent with the Declarations in the Charters or Arguments on the Emigrations, that the Subject should enjoy those real Rights, to which he was born in the Realm of *England*. How quibbling then must it be in this Right Honourable Pamphleteer, and all his Minions, to deduce from these Charters, "only a Corporation Right to make Bye-Laws, sub-ject to every whimsical Alteration of some pretended Supreme Legislature?" Is such a Construction of the Charters (if there was any Doubt or Ambiguity in them) tending to the sole or indeed the least Benefit of the Subject, when it is brought

in as an Argument, to divest him of the very Essence of his Liberty? Could a Free People be supposed to give up such a Castle, garrison'd so strongly as it is with Charters, &c. as before, and Part with their Right so inherent in them, for trifling a Power as that of a pitiful Corporation only? Certainly they who think so, must themselves have Ears, without Understanding.

Having thus answered the Right Honourable Pamphleteer, with Regard to some Explofions that he made very immethodically, in Support of the Right of Taxing the Colonies; I shall now take the Liberty of paying my Respects to Arguments circulating on this Side the Atlantic. A late Northern Speech-maker, however he may have entertain'd himself, has surprized every sensible Reader that is acquainted with the English Constitution, with this strange Position, "That in an Empire extended and diversified as Great-Britain is, there must of Necessity be a supreme Legislature, to which all other Powers must be subordinate." There is an actual Supremacy existing in every Legislation, held under and according to the English Constitution: THE KING OF THE WHOLE REALM who is not only the first Mover in every such Power, in as much as no Representative can be elected for any Parliament in any Part of the Realm, without his express Writ for that Purpose; and no Representative when elected, can hold any Parliament, without his especial Permission and Direction: But he is also the last controuling Power of every Parliament, in as much as no Act or Thing, can bind as of universal Obligation in the Realm, without his Royal Assent; and by his supreme Command or Delegation, every Parliament under the Constitution, may be prorogued or dissolved. What then, can that Necessity be for a further supremacy in Legislation, or that Subordination argued for, to any Power but that which the Constitution has always held pertaining as of peculiar Privilege, to his most sacred Majesty? Certainly the Thought (tho' we may imagine it came gliding down the Current of a well-toned Delivery) was something too florid for the Constitution of *England*, and will introduce, if carried into Effect, many Kings instead of one. There was a Compliment also paid to this fancied supreme Legislature, where that Gentleman would fix it, that of its being "The very Sanctuary of Liberty and Justice."

To which I beg Leave to observe, that we either have different Notions of the Meaning of those Words, or else different Conceptions of the Matter in Debate. I take it, that the Americans are contending for the Privilege of being solely governed and taxed by Laws made with the Consent of the Majority of their own Representatives, according to the Englishman's inherent Birthright; a Thing so very essential to the very Being of Liberty, that it must argue a very confin'd Brain, even to fancy that it can possibly exist any where, without the Enjoyment of that inherent Birthright, for Liberty without Property, loses one of its most essential Ideas; and where can Property be ever sacred, that shall be (supposed only to be) subject to the momentary Will of any supreme Legislature, constituted without the Representatives of the People who hold that Property? I am at a Loss then, to know how a Place where it must be confessed (that his Argument for a supremacy in Legislature admits) that this prodigious Privilege has been violated, can be stiled the Sanctuary of Liberty or Justice. Certainly this Gentleman must in imitation of the Right Honourable Pamphleteer, have fancied that he also was dictating to Persons who have Ears without Understanding. If I stand in Need of any Apology for treating such Doctrines and Positions as they deserve, let the Reader reflect, that every American in Defence of his own, and Public Liberty, must be more nobly concerned than any one, perhaps only pleading for the personal Enjoyment of a single Government, and therefore he may Claim a greater Indulgence.

Some who dispute this Claim in the Americans, of being only governed and taxed by Laws, consented to by the Majority of their Representatives, tell us, that our emigrating Ancestors sold their Rights